arXiv:1411.5183v1 [nucl-th] 19 Nov 2014

Derivative corrections to the symmetry energy and the isovector dipole-resonance structure in nuclei

J P Blocki
National Centre of Nuclear Research, PL-00681 Warsaw, Poland
A G Magner*
Institute for Nuclear Research, Kyiv 03680, Ukraine
P Ring
Technical Munich University, D-85747 Garching, Germany

Pacs Ref: 21.10.Dr, 21.65.Cd, 21.60.Ev, 24.30.Cz

Abstract

The effective surface approximation is extended accounting for derivatives of the symmetry energy density per particle. Using the analytical isovector surface energy constants within the Fermi-liquid droplet model, one obtains energies and sum rules of the isovector dipole resonance structure in a reasonable agreement with the experimental data and other theoretical approaches.

Keywords: Nuclear binding energy, liquid droplet model, extended Thomas-Fermi approach, surface symmetry energy, neutron skin, isovector stiffness.

1. Introduction

The symmetry energy is a key quantity for study of the fundamental properties of exotic nuclei with a large excess of neutrons above protons in the nuclear and astronomic physics [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In spite of a very intensive study of these properties, the derivatives of the symmetry energy and its surface coefficient are still rather undetermined in the calculations by the liquid droplet model (LDM) [1], or within more general local density approach (LDA) [9, 10], in particular within the extended Thomas-Fermi (ETF) approximation [11], and models based on the Hartree-Fock (HF) method [12] with applying the Skyrme forces [13, 14, 15, 16], in contrast to the basic volume symmetry energy constant. Within the nuclear LDA, the variational condition derived from minimizing the nuclear energy at the fixed particle number and the neutron excess above protons can be simplified using the expansion in a small parameter $a/R \sim A^{-1/3}$ for heavy enough nuclei with a being of the order of the diffuse edge thickness of the nucleus, R the mean curvature radius of the ES, and A the number of nucleons within the effective surface (ES) approximation [17, 18, 19, 20, 21] . A separation of the nuclear energy into the volume and surface (and curvature) components of the LDM and ETF makes obviously sense for $a/R \ll 1$. The accuracy of the ES approximation in the ETF approach [11] was checked [19] with the spin-orbit (SO) and asymmetry terms [20, 21] by comparing results with those of the Hartree-Fock (HF) and other ETF theories for some Skyrme forces.

Solutions for the isoscalar and isovector particle densities in the ES approximation of the ETF approach were applied to the analytical calculations of the surface symmetry-energy constants and the neutron skin in the leading order of the parameter a/R [20, 21]. Our results are compared with the previous ones [1, 2, 3, 4] in the LDM and recent works [5, 6, 7, 8, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26].

The structure of the isovector dipole-resonance (IVDR) strength in terms of the main and satellite (pygmy) modes [23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33] as a function of the isovector surface energy constant in the ES approach can be described within the Fermi-liquid droplet (FLD) model [34, 35]. The analytical expressions for the surface symmetry energy constants are tested by the energies and sum rules of the isovector dipole resonance (IVDR) strength structure within the FLD model [33].

In the present work, we shall extend the variational effective surface method [21, 33] taking into account also derivatives of the non-gradient terms in the symmetry energy density along with its gradient ones. The fundamental isovector derivative and surface-tension constants are not fixed yet well enough by using the experimental data for the neutron skin thickness [8]. We suggest to use also the empirical data for the splitting of the IVDR strength structure to evaluate them better through their analytical ETF expressions in the ES approximation as functions of the Skyrme force parameters.

2. Symmetry energy and particle densities

We start with the nuclear energy as a functional of the isoscalar and isovector particle densities $\rho_\pm = \rho_n \pm \rho_p$ in the local density approach [11, 13]: $E = \int \mathrm{d}\mathbf{r}\, \rho_+ \mathcal{E}(\rho_+, \rho_-)$, where

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho_+, \rho_-) \approx -b_V + JI^2 + \varepsilon_+(\rho_+, \epsilon) + \varepsilon_-(\rho_+, \rho_-, \epsilon) + \\ + \quad (\mathcal{C}_+/\rho_+ + \mathcal{D}_+)(\nabla\rho_+)^2 + (\mathcal{C}_-/\rho_+ + \mathcal{D}_-)(\nabla\rho_-)^2 \qquad (1)$$

*e-mail: *magner@kinr.kiev.ua*

and

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_-(\rho_+,\rho_-,\epsilon) &= \mathcal{S}_{\rm sym}(\epsilon)\,(\rho_-/\rho_+)^2 - JI^2,\\ \mathcal{S}_{\rm sym}(\epsilon) &= J - L\epsilon + K_-\epsilon^2/2. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We introduced also a small parameter ϵ of the expansion following suggestions of Myers and Swiatecki [1], $\epsilon = (\rho_\infty - \rho_+)/(3\rho_\infty)$, where $\rho_\infty = 3/4\pi r_0^3 \approx 0.16$ fm^{-3} is the density of the infinite nuclear matter and $r_0 = R/A^{1/3}$ is the radius constant. In (1), $b_V \approx 16$ MeV is the separation energy per particle. The isoscalar part of the surface energy-density (1) (zero-order terms in expansion over ρ_-/ρ_+, denoted as δ [1]) which does not depend explicitly on the density gradient terms, is determined by the function $\varepsilon_+(\rho_+,\epsilon)$. We use a representation $\varepsilon_+ = K_+\overline{\varepsilon}_+/18$ by the dimensionless quantity $\overline{\varepsilon}_+$. K_+ is the isoscalar incompressibility modulus of the symmetric nuclear matter, $K_+ \approx 220 - 245$ MeV,

$$\overline{\epsilon}_+(\rho_+,\epsilon) = 9\epsilon^2 + I^2\left[\mathcal{S}_{\rm sym}(\epsilon) - J\right]/K_+, \quad (3)$$

$I = (N-Z)/A$ is the asymmetry parameter, $N = \int {\rm d}\mathbf{r}\rho_n(\mathbf{r})$ and $Z = \int {\rm d}\mathbf{r}\rho_p(\mathbf{r})$ are the neutron and proton numbers and $A = N + Z$. The second term, $\propto I^2$, appears due to the derivative corrections to the volume symmetry energy. The symmetry energy constant of the nuclear matter $J \approx 30$ MeV specifies the main volume term in the symmetry energy. In contrast to the simplest approximation [21], terms with $L \approx 20 \div 120$ MeV, and even less known $K_- \approx -470 \div 140$ MeV [5, 8], defined by the first and second derivatives of the symmetry energy expansion with respect to the variable ϵ were taken into account (2), (3). Equation (1) can be applied in a semiclassical approximation for realistic Skyrme forces [14, 15, 16], in particular by neglecting higher $\hbar$ corrections (the ETF kinetic energy) [11] and Coulomb terms [19, 20, 21]. Up to a small Coulomb exchange terms they all can be easily taken into account [17, 21]. Constants $\mathcal{C}_\pm$ and $\mathcal{D}_\pm$ are defined by parameters of the Skyrme forces [11, 13, 14, 15, 16]. For $\mathcal{C}_\pm$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_+ &= \frac{1}{12}\left(t_1 - \frac{25}{12}t_2 - \frac{5}{3}t_2x_2\right),\\ \mathcal{C}_- &= -\frac{1}{48}t_1\left(1+\frac{5}{2}x_1\right) - \frac{1}{36}t_2\left(1+\frac{19}{8}x_2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The isoscalar SO gradient terms in (1) are defined with a constant: $\mathcal{D}_+ = -9mW_0^2/16\hbar^2$, where $W_0 \approx 100$ - 130 MeV·fm^5 and m is the nucleon mass [11, 13, 14, 15]. The isovector SO constant $\mathcal{D}_-$ is usually relatively small and will be neglected here for simplicity. We emphasize that (1) has a general form [18, 19, 20] for any densed system with a sharp edge. In particular, it can be derived from comparison with one of energy density functionals determined by a Skyrme force in order to get relations (4) for $\mathcal{C}_\pm$ and other ones in terms of its parameters.

Equation (1) contains the volume component given by the first two terms and the surface part including the L and K_- derivative corrections of the ε_- and density gradients which both are important for the finite nuclear systems [21]. These gradient terms together with other surface terms of the energy density in the ES approximation are responsible for the surface tension in finite nuclei.

Minimizing the energy E under constraints of the fixed particle number $A = \int {\rm d}\mathbf{r}\ \rho_+(\mathbf{r})$ and neutron excess $N - Z = \int {\rm d}\mathbf{r}\ \rho_-(\mathbf{r})$ (also other constraints as a deformation, nuclear angular momentum and so on [17, 18, 19, 21]), one arrives at the Lagrange equations with the isoscalar and isovector chemical potentials as corresponding multipliers. The analytical solutions will be obtained approximately up to the order $A^{2/3}$ in the binding energy. To satisfy these constraints for calculations of the particle densities, one needs the leading order terms in $a/R \sim A^{-1/3}$ for calculations of the particle densities $\rho_\pm$. Using these densities for the nuclear energy calculations with a required accuracy we account for higher (next) order surface corrections in a/R with respect to the leading order terms [21].

3. Extended densities and energies

For the isoscalar particle density, $w = w_+ = \rho_+/\rho_\infty$, one has up to the *leading* terms in the parameter a/R the usual first-order differential Lagrange equation [19, 20, 21] but with the solution depending on L and K_- through ε_+ (3),

$$x = -\int_{w_r}^{w} {\rm d}y \sqrt{\frac{1+\beta y}{y\overline{\epsilon}_+(y,\epsilon)}}, \quad x = \frac{\xi}{a}, \quad (5)$$

for $x < x(w=0)$ and $w = 0$ for $x \geq x(w=0)$ where $x(w=0)$ is the turning point, ξ is the distance from a given spatial point to the ES in a local coordinate system (ξ,η) ($\xi = r - R$ for spherical nuclei and η is the tangent-to-ES coordinate [18]). $\overline{\epsilon}_+(y,\epsilon)$ (3) is the dimensionless energy density ε_+ per particle (1) and $\beta = \mathcal{D}_+\rho_\infty/\mathcal{C}_+$ is the dimensionless SO parameter. For $w_r = w(x=0)$ up to I^2 corrections, one has the boundary condition, ${\rm d}^2w(x)/{\rm d}x^2 = 0$ at the ES ($x = 0$):

$$\overline{\epsilon}_+(w_r) + w_r(1+\beta w_r)\left[{\rm d}\overline{\epsilon}_+(w)/{\rm d}w\right]_{w=w_r} = 0\,. \quad (6)$$

In Eq. (5), $a \approx 0.5 - 0.6$ fm is the diffuseness parameter [21],

$$a = \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{C}_+\rho_\infty K_+}{30b_V^2}}, \quad (7)$$

For the isovector density, $w_-(x) = \rho_-/(\rho_\infty I)$, after simple transformations of the isovector Lagrange equation up to the leading term in a/R in the ES approximation, one similarly finds the equation and boundary condition for $w_-(w)$ [21],

$$\frac{{\rm d}w_-}{{\rm d}w} = c_{\rm sym}\sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{S}_{\rm sym}(\epsilon)(1+\beta w)}{J\overline{\epsilon}_+(w)}}\ \sqrt{\left|1 - \frac{w_-^2}{w^2}\right|}, \quad (8)$$

and $w_-(w=1) = 1$; $\mathcal{S}_{\rm sym}(\epsilon)$ is given by (2) and

$$c_{\rm sym} = a\left[J/(\rho_\infty|\mathcal{C}_-|)\right]^{1/2}, \quad (9)$$



Fig. 1: Isovector w_- (11) [with ($L = 50$ and 100 MeV) and without ($L = 0$) derivative constant L] and isoscalar $w = w_+$ (see [21]) particle densities are shown vs $x = \xi/a$ for the Skyrme force SLy5* ($x \approx (r - R)/a$ for small nuclear deformations [16, 33]).



Fig. 2: Isovector density $w_-(x)$ (11) (in the logarithmic scale) as function of x within the quadratic approximation to $\overline{\varepsilon}_+(w)$ for several Skyrme forces [14, 15, 16]; ($L = 48.269$ MeV for SLy5 and $L = 47.449$ MeV for SLy6 [37], which are approximately 50 MeV within a precision of the line thickness; and a similar approximation was used for other forces.

see [21] for the case of the constant $\mathcal{S}_{\rm sym} = J$. The analytical solution $w_- = w\cos[\psi(w)]$ can be obtained through the expansion of ψ in powers of

$$\gamma(w) = 3\epsilon/c_{\rm sym}. \tag{10}$$

Expanding up to the second order in γ, one finds [36]

$$w_- = w\,\cos\psi(w) \approx w\left(1 - \psi^2(w)/2 + ...\right), \tag{11}$$

where

$$\psi(w) = \gamma(w)\left[1 + \widetilde{c}\gamma(w) + ...\right]/\sqrt{1+\beta}, \tag{12}$$

$$\widetilde{c} = [\beta c_{\rm sym}^2 + 2 + c_{\rm sym}^2 L(1+\beta)]/[3(1+\beta)]. \tag{13}$$

The L dependence of w_- appears at the second order in γ but w_- is independent of K_- at this order. Note that K_- is the coefficient in expansions (2) and (3) at higher order ϵ^2, and therefore, it shows up at higher (third) order terms of the expansion (11) in γ [21].

In Fig. 1, the L dependence of the function $w_-(x)$ within rather a large interval $L = 0 - 100$ MeV [6] is shown as compared to that of the density $w(x)$ for the SLy5* force as a typical example ($L = 45.885 \approx 50$ MeV [37] and Table I). As shown in Fig. 2 in a logarithmic scale, one observes a big difference in the isovector densities w_- derived from different Skyrme forces [14, 15, 16] within the diffuse edge. All these calculations have been done with the finite value of the slope parameter L taken approximately from [15, 37] (Table I), which is important for calculations of the neutron skins of nuclei. The isovector particle density w_- (11) in the second order of the small parameter γ does not depend on the symmetry energy in-compressibility K_- as mentioned above. Therefore, it is possible to study first the main slope effects of L neglecting small I^2 corrections to the isoscalar particle density w_+ [21] through the $\overline{\varepsilon}_+$ (3). Then, we may deal with more precisely the effect of the second derivatives K_- taking into account higher order terms.

We emphasize that the dimensionless densities, $w(x)$ [21] and $w_-(x)$ (11), shown in Figs. 1 and 2 were obtained in the leading ES approximation ($a/R \ll 1$) as functions of the specific combinations of the Skyrme force parameters like β, $c_{\rm sym}$ [21] but taking into account now the L-dependence. They are the universal distributions independent of the specific properties of the nucleus [21]. It yields approximately the local density distributions in the normal-to-ES direction ξ with the correct asymptotical behavior outside of the ES layer for any deformation at $a/R \ll 1$, as well as for the semi-infinite nuclear matter. Densities $w_\pm$ are universal distributions independent of the specific properties of nuclei.

The nuclear energy E in this improved ES approximation is split into the volume and surface terms [21],

$$E \approx -b_V\, A + J(N-Z)^2/A + E_S^{(+)} + E_S^{(-)}. \tag{14}$$

For the isoscalar (+) and isovector (-) surface energy components $E_S^{(\pm)}$, one obtains $E_S^{(\pm)} = b_S^{(\pm)} S/(4\pi r_0^2)$, where S is the surface area of the ES, $b_S^{(\pm)}$ are the isoscalar (+) and isovector (−) surface energy constants,

$$b_S^{(\pm)} \approx 8\pi r_0^2 \mathcal{C}_\pm \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} {\rm d}\xi\ \left(1 + \mathcal{D}_\pm \rho_+/\mathcal{C}_\pm\right)\left(\partial\rho_\pm/\partial\xi\right)^2. \tag{15}$$

These constants are proportional to the corresponding surface tension coefficients $\sigma_\pm = b_S^{(\pm)}/(4\pi r_0^2)$ through solutions for $\rho_\pm(\xi)$ [see (5) and 11)] which can be taken into account in the leading order of a/R . These coefficients $\sigma_\pm$ are the same as found in expressions for the capillary pressures of the macroscopic boundary conditions [see [21] extended to new $\varepsilon_\pm$ (2) and (3) modified by L and K_- derivative corrections]. Within the improved ES approximation where higher order corrections in the small parameter a/R are taken into account, we derived equations

for the nuclear surface itself. For more exact isoscalar and isovector particle densities we account for the main terms in the next order of the parameter a/R in the Lagrange equations [36]. Multiplying these equations by $\partial\rho_-/\partial\xi$ and integrating them over the ES in the direction ξ and using solutions for $w_\pm(x)$ up to the leading orders [see (5) and (11)], one arrives at the ES equations in the form of the macroscopic boundary conditions [21, 35]. They ensure equilibrium through the equivalence of the volume and surface (capillary) pressure (isoscalar or isovector) variations. The latter ones are proportional to the surface tension coefficients $\sigma_\pm$. For the energy surface coefficients $b_S^{(\pm)}$ (15), one obtains

$$b_S^{(+)} = 6\mathcal{C}_+ \frac{\rho_\infty \mathcal{J}_+}{r_0 a}, \quad \mathcal{J}_+ = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}w [w(1+\beta w)\overline{\varepsilon}_+(w)]^{1/2}, \quad (16)$$

and

$$b_S^{(-)} = k_S\, I^2, \qquad k_S = 6\mathcal{C}_- \frac{\rho_\infty \mathcal{J}_-}{r_0 a}, \qquad (17)$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_- = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}w \left[\frac{w\overline{\epsilon}_+(w)}{(1+\beta w)}\right]^{1/2} \{\cos\psi + \left[w\sin\psi/\left(c_{\rm sym}\sqrt{1+\beta}\right)\right][1+2\widetilde{c}\gamma(w)]\Big\}^2 . \quad (18)$$

For γ and $\widetilde{c}$, see (10) and (13). For $\mathcal{J}_-$ one can use the following approximation:

$$\mathcal{J}_- \approx \int_0^1 (1-w)\mathrm{d}w \sqrt{\frac{w}{1+\beta w}} \left\{1 + \frac{2\gamma(w)}{c_{\rm sym}(1+\beta)} + \frac{\gamma^2}{(1+\beta)^2}\left[\frac{1}{c_{\rm sym}^2} + 6(1+\beta)\left(\frac{\widetilde{c}}{c_{\rm sym}} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right]\right\}. \quad (19)$$

Simple expressions for constants $b_S^{(\pm)}$ can be easily derived in terms of the algebraic and trigonometric functions for the quadratic form of $\overline{\epsilon}_+(w,\epsilon)$ ($\epsilon = 0$). In these derivations we neglected curvature terms and, being of the same order, shell corrections. The isovector energy terms were obtained within the ES approximation with the high accuracy up to a small $I^2(a/R)^2$.

According to the macroscopic theory [1, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21], one may define the isovector stiffness Q with respect to the difference $R_n - R_p$ between the neutron and proton radii as a collective variable,

$$Q = -k_S I^2/\tau^2, \qquad (20)$$

where τ is the neutron skin in r_0 units. Defining the neutron and proton radii $R_{n,p}$ as the positions of the maxima of the neutron and proton density gradients, respectively, one obtains the neutron skin τ [21],

$$\tau = \frac{R_n - R_p}{r_0} \approx \frac{8aIg(w_r)}{r_0 c_{sym}^2}, \qquad (21)$$

with

$$g(w) = \frac{w^{3/2}(1+\beta w)^{5/2}}{(1+\beta)(3w+1+4\beta w)} \Big\{w\,(1+2\widetilde{c}\gamma)^2 + 2\gamma\,(1+\widetilde{c}\gamma)\,[\widetilde{c}w - c_{sym}\,(1+2\widetilde{c}\gamma)]\Big\}, \qquad (22)$$

	SLy5	SLy5*	SVsym28	SVsym32
L(MeV)	50	50	10	60
$k_{S,0}$(MeV)	-12.6	-13.1	11.4	15.6
k_S(MeV)	-13.8	-15.0	11.6	17.6
ν_0	0.37	0.92	0.90	0.84
ν	0.66	0.60	0.83	0.69
Q_0 (MeV)	73	72	-62	-55
Q(MeV)	49	41	-56	-37
τ_0/I	0.54	0.43	0.43	0.53
τ/I	0.53	0.60	0.45	0.69
D_0(MeV)	101	89	78	79
D(MeV)	100	89	78	78

Table I. Isovector energy coefficients k_S and stiffness Q (23) (in units MeV), factor ν, neutron skin τ/I, and constant $D = \hbar\omega_{FLD}A^{1/3}$ of the IVGDR excitation energy $\hbar\omega_{FLD}$ (in MeV) for the ^{132}Sn are shown for a few Skyrme forces at different slope parameters L [22, 15, 37]; the zero low index means that L is neglected; the relaxation time T [40] is the same as used in Figures.

taken at the ES value w_r [$w''(w_r) = 0$ (6)]. Accounting also for (17) and (19), one finally arrives at

$$Q = -\nu\, J^2/k_S, \quad \nu = 9\mathcal{J}_-^2/[16g^2(w_r)], \qquad (23)$$

where $\mathcal{J}_-$ and $g(w)$ are given by (17), (19) and (22), respectively. This Q with $\nu = 9/4$ has been predicted earlier [1]. However, in our derivations ν deviates from 9/4, and it is proportional to the function $\mathcal{J}_-^2/g^2(w_r)$. This function depends significantly on the SO interaction parameter β but not too much on the specific Skyrme forces [21, 33]. The isovector stiffness coefficient Q (23) depend essentially on constants $\mathcal{C}_-$ and L (also K_-) through ν (23) and k_S (17) (and equations (3) and (2)).

The universal functions $w(x)$ [21] and $w_-(x)$ (11) in the leading order of the ES approximation can be used [analytically in the quadratic approximation for $\overline{\varepsilon}_+(w)$] for calculations of the surface energy coefficients $b_S^{(\pm)}$ (15) and the neutron skin $\tau \propto I$. As it was shown [21], only these particle density distributions $w(x)$ and $w_-(x)$ within the surface layer are needed through their derivatives.

Therefore, the surface symmetry-energy coefficient k_S (17), the neutron skin τ (21) and the isovector stiffness Q (23) can be approximated analytically in terms of functions of the critical surface combinations of the Skyrme parameters a, β, $b_S^{(\pm)}$, $c_{\rm sym}$, as well as the volume ones ρ_∞, K, J, and derivatives of the symmetry energy L and K_-. Thus, they are independent of the specific properties of the nucleus in the ES approximation.

4. Discussion of the results

In Table I we show the isovector energy coefficient k_S [Eq. (17)], the isovector stiffness parameter Q (23), its

Skyrmes	L MeV	E_1 MeV	E_2 MeV	S_1 %	S_2 %	D MeV	k_S MeV	Q MeV	τ/I
SLy5* ^{132}Sn	0	17.15	19.85	87.9	12.1	88.9	-13.1	72	0.43
	50	17.18	19.86	88.8	11.2	88.8	-14.2	48	0.54
	60	17.18	19.86	89.0	11.0	88.8	-14.5	45	0.57
	70	17.18	19.87	89.2	10.8	88.7	-14.8	42	0.59
	80	17.19	19.87	89.5	10.5	88.8	-15.1	40	0.62
	90	17.19	19.87	89.7	10.3	88.8	-15.5	38	0.64
	100	17.20	19.87	89.9	10.1	88.8	-15.8	36	0.67
^{208}Pb	50	14.65	17.14	91.5	8.5	87.9	-14.2	48	0.54
SVsym32 ^{132}Sn	0	14.70	18.00	72.9	27.1	78.8	15.6	-55	0.53
	50	14.69	17.99	75.1	24.9	78.4	17.2	-39	0.66
	60	14.69	17.98	75.5	24.5	78.3	17.6	-37	0.69
	70	14.69	17.98	76.0	24.0	78.2	18.0	-35	0.71
	80	14.69	17.98	76.4	23.6	78.2	18.4	-33	0.74
	90	14.68	17.97	76.9	23.1	78.3	18.9	-32	0.77
	100	14.68	17.97	77.4	22.6	78.0	19.3	-30	0.80
^{208}Pb	60	12.71	15.56	83.1	16.9	77.7	17.6	-37	0.69

Table II. Energies E_n $(n = 1, 2)$, EWSRs S_n, average IVDR (IVGDR) energy constants D, surface symmetry energy k_S and isovector stiffness Q constants, and neutron skin τ/I vs the slope parameter L in a typical region [8] for the same Skyrme forces SLy5* or SVsym32 and relaxation time T as in Tables I and Figures; index 1 corresponds to the main mode and index 2 to the satellite one; the results for ^{208}Pb are shown for the comparison.

constant ν and the neutron skin τ (21). They were obtained for a few Skyrme forces [14, 15, 16] with different values of L within the ES approximation using the quadratic approximation for $\overline{\varepsilon}_+(w, \epsilon = 0)$ [21], and neglecting the I^2 slope corrections. We also show the quantities $k_{S,0}$, ν_0, Q_0 and τ_0 where the slope corrections are neglected ($L = 0$). In contrast to a fairly good agreement for the analytical isoscalar energy constant $b_S^{(+)}$ [21] with that of [21, 14, 15, 16], the isovector energy coefficients Q (or $k_S = \nu J^2/Q$) are more sensitive to the choice of the Skyrme forces than the isoscalar ones [21]. The modula of Q are significantly smaller for most of the Skyrme forces SLy [14, 16] and SV [15] than for the other ones, in contrast to the symmetry energy constant k_S for which one has the opposite behavior. However, the L dependence of k_S is not more pronounced than that of Q (Table I and II). For SLy and SV forces the stiffnesses Q are correspondingly significantly smaller in absolute value being more close to the well-known empirical values of Q [4] and semi-microscopic HF calculations [6, 11], especially with increasing L. Note that the $|Q|$ is rather more decreased with L than k_S, sometimes for SLy and SV in factor of about two. Thus, the isovector stiffness Q is even much more sensitive to constants of the Skyrme force and to the slope parameter L than constants k_S.

Swiatecki and his collaborators [4] suggested the isovector stiffness values $Q \approx 30 - 35$ MeV accounting for the additional experimental data. More precise A-dependence of the averaged IVDR (Isovector Giant Dipole Resonance, IVGDR) energy D_{FLD} for the finite values of Q seems to be beyond the accuracy of the both hydrodynamical and FLD model calculations. More realistic self-consistent HF calculations with the Coulomb interaction, surface-curvature and quantum-shell effects lead to larger $Q \approx 30 - 80$ MeV [6, 11].

The IVGDR energies and the energy weighted sum rules (EWSR) obtained within the semiclassical FLD approach based on the Landau-Vlasov equation [35, 33] with the macroscopic boundary conditions [21] are also basically insensitive to the isovector surface energy constants k_S or Q. They are similarly in good agreement with the experimental data, and do not depend much on the Skyrme forces, also when the finite slope symmetry energy parameter L is included (the two last rows in Table I and 7th column of Table II).

An investigation of the splitting of the IVDR within this approach into the main peak which exhausts mainly the model-independent EWSR and a much broader satellite (pygmy-like resonances with a much smaller contribution to the EWSR [23, 24, 25, 26, 33]) is extended now by taking into account the slope L dependence of the symmetry energy density. Note that the relative strength of the satellite mode with respect to that of the main peak disappears as I in the limit of symmetric nuclei [34, 35].

The total IVDR strength function being the sum of the two ("out-of-phase" $n = 1$ and "in-phase" $n = 2$) modes for the isovector- and isoscalar-like volume particle density vibrations, respectively [Fig. 3 for the finite $L = 50$ MeV] have a shape asymmetry [33] (the SLy5* forces are taken again as a typical example). The L dependence of the total IVDR strength is shown in Fig. 4 for the SLy5* and Fig. 5



Fig. 3: IVDR strength functions $S(\omega)$ vs the excitation energy $\hbar\omega$ are shown for vibrations of the nucleus ^{132}Sn for the Skyrme force SLy5* by solid line at $L = 50MeV$; dotted ("out-of-phase"), and dashed ("in-phase") curves show separately the main and satellite excitation modes, respectively [33]; the relaxation time of the collision term $T = 4.3 \cdot 10^{-21}$ s in agreement with widths of the IVGDRs.



Fig. 4: The same total strenghts as in Fig. 3 are shown for different $L = 0, 50, 60$ and 100 MeV by dashed, thick and thin solid and dotted lines.



Fig. 5: The same as in Fig. 4 but for SVsym32 Skyrme force ($L = 60$ MeV) at the relaxation time T with the same constant of the frequency dependence as in the previous Figure ([40]), $T = 7.5 \cdot 10^{-21}$ s.

for SVsym32 cases. The characteristic values of L are used in these calculations ($L \approx 50$ MeV for the SLy5* force [37] and $L \approx 60$ MeV for the SVsym32 one [15]). In Figs. 3 and 4 for the SLy5* and Fig. 5 for SVsym32 forces, one has the "in-phase" satellite to the right of the main "out-of-phase" peak. An enhancement on its left for SLy5* is due to the increasing of the "out-of-phase" strength (dotted) curve at small energies as compared to the IVGDR (Fig. 3 and 4), in contrast to the SVsym32 case shown in Fig. 5. The IVDR energies of the two modes in the nucleus ^{132}Sn do not change significantly with L in both cases (Table II). However, as seen from Table II and Figs. 4 and 5, the L dependence of the EWSRs of these modes for SVsym32 is larger than for SLy5*. Notice, the essential re-distribution of the EWSR contributions among them due to a significant enhancement of the main "out-of-phase" peak with increasing L for SLy5* (Figs. 3 and 4) and more pronounced EWSR re-distribution with L for SVsym32 (Fig. 5) in the same nucleus (Table II). Slopes of the L dependence of τ/I which is almost linear are approximately the same for both considered Skyrmes but smaller than those found in [8] probably due to different definitions of the neutron skin thickness τ [21] which are related to the value of $\delta_S = \rho_-/\rho_+$ at the nuclear effective surface [1]. Note also that these more precise calculations (cf. with those of [21, 33]) take into account higher (4th order) terms of the power expansion in the small parameter γ for any reasonable L change [8]. This is essentially important for the IVDR strength distribution for SV forces because of smaller $c_{\rm sym}$ as compared to those for other Skyrme interactions. Constants $\widetilde{c}$ for the isovector solutions w_-, (11), are modified essentially (besides of the L dependence) by higher order terms due to a non-linearity equation for $\psi(w)$ solved in terms of the power series. Decreasing the relaxation time T in factor of about 1.5 with respect to the value (Figures) evaluated from the data on the widths of the IVGDRs at their energies almost does not change the IVDR strength structure [40]. However, we found its strong dependence on T in a more wide value region [in factor of about 2-3]. The "in-phase" strength component with rather a wide maximum is weakly dependent on the choice of the Skyrme forces [14, 15, 16] and on the slope parameter L, as well as the relaxation time T.

The most responsible parameter of the Skyrme HF approach leading to the significant differences in the k_S and Q values is the constant $\mathcal{C}_-$ (4) in the gradient terms of the energy density (1). Indeed, the key quantity in the expression for Q (23) and the isovector surface energy constant k_S (17), is the constant $\mathcal{C}_-$ because one mainly has $k_S \propto \mathcal{C}_-$ [21], and $Q \propto 1/k_S \propto 1/\mathcal{C}_-$. Concerning k_S and the IVDR strength structure, this is even more important than the L dependence though the latter changes significantly the isovector stiffness Q and the neutron skin τ. The constant $\mathcal{C}_-$ is very different for different Skyrme forces in the absolute value and even sign, $\mathcal{C}_- \approx -23$ to 26 MeV·fm^5 ($k_S \approx -15$ to 18 MeV). Contrary to the isoscalar parameters ($b_S^{(+)}$), there are so far no clear experiments which would determine k_S well enough because the mean energies of the IVGDR (main peaks) do not depend very much on k_S for different Skyrme forces (see last row of Table I and 7th column of Table II). Perhaps, the low-lying isovector collective states are more sensitive but there is

no careful systematic study of their k_S dependence at the present time. Another reason for so different k_S and Q values might be traced back to the difficulties in deducing k_S directly from the HF calculations due to the curvature and quantum effects in contrast to $b_S^{(+)}$. It is worthwhile to study the semi-infinite matter within our approach to avoid such effects and compare with semimicroscopic models. We have to go also far away from the nuclear stability line to subtract uniquely the coefficient k_S in the dependence of $b_S^{(-)} \propto I^2 = (N-Z)^2/A^2$, according to (17). For exotic nuclei one has more problems to relate k_S to the experimental data with a good enough precision. The L dependence of the neutron skin τ is essential but not dramatic in the case of SLy and SV forces (Table I). The precision of such a description depends more on the specific nuclear models [6]. Our results for the neutron skin $R_n - R_p \approx 0.10 - 0.13$ fm in ^{208}Pb (Table II) in a reasonable agreement with the experimental data (Fig. 3 of [8]), $(R_n - R_p)_{\rm exp} = 0.12 - 0.14$ fm (the coefficient $(3/5)^{1/2}$ of the square-mean neutron and proton radii was taken into account to adopt the definitions, see also very precised experimental data [41]). For ^{132}Sn our analytical evaluation predict the neutron skin thickness $(R_n - R_p)_{\rm exp} \approx 0.12 - 0.15$ fm ($0.08 - 0.10$ fm for a more known nucleus ^{120}Sn, also in agreement with the experimental data collected in [8]). The neutron skin thickness τ, like the stiffness Q, is interesting in many aspects for the investigation of exotic nuclei, in particular, in nuclear astrophysics.

We emphasize that for the specific Skyrme forces there exist an abnormal behavior of the isovector surface constants k_S and Q as related mainly to the fundamental constant $\mathcal{C}_-$ of the energy density (1) but not much to the derivative symmetry-energy density corrections. The coefficient ν (23) is almost independent on $\mathcal{C}_-$ for SLy and SV Skyrme forces (Table I). As compared to 9/4 suggested in [1], they are significantly smaller in magnitude for the most of the Skyrme forces, besides of SkM* ($\nu \approx 2.3$).

Notice that the isovector gradient terms which are important for the consistent derivations within the ES approach are not included into the relativistic local density approaches [38, 39]. In contrast to all other Skyrme forces, for RATP [14] and SV [15] (like for SkI) forces, the isovector stiffness Q is even negative as $\mathcal{C}_- > 0$ ($k_S > 0$), that would correspond to the unstable vibration of the neutron skin.

5. Conclusions

Simple expressions for the isovector particle densities and energies in the leading ES approximation were obtained analytically, i.e., for the surface symmetry energy, the neutron skin thickness and the isovector stiffness coefficients as functions of the slope parameter L. We have to include higher order terms in the parameter a/R to derive the surface symmetry energy. It depends on the particle density which can be taken into account at leading order in a/R. These terms depend on the well-known parameters of the Skyrme forces. Our results for the isovector surface energy constant k_S, the neutron skin thickness τ and the stiffness Q depend in a sensitive way on the choice of the parameters of the Skyrme energy density (1), especially on its gradient terms through the parameter $\mathcal{C}_-$ (4). Values of the isovector constants k_S, τ, and especially, Q depend also essentially on the slope parameter L, and the spin-orbit interaction constant β. The isovector stiffness constants Q become more close to the empirical data accounting for their L-dependence. The mean IVGDR energies and sum rules calculated in the macroscopic models like the FLD model [35, 33] are in a fairly good agreement with the experimental data. We found a reasonable two-mode main and satellite structure of the IVDR strength within the FLD model as compared to the experimental data and recent other theoretical works. We may interprete semiclassically the IVDR satellites as some kind of the pygmy resonances. Their energies and sum rules obtained analytically within the semiclassical FLD approximation are sensitive to the surface symmetry energy constant k_S. Energies E_1 and E_2 (Table II) are independent of the slope parameter L but EWSRs S_1 and S_2 do depend on L, especially for SVsym32. It seems helpful to describe them in terms of the only few critical constants, like k_S and L. Therefore, their comparison with the experimental data on the IVDR strength splitting can be used for the evaluation of k_S and L, in addition to the experimental data for the neutron skin.

For further perspectives, it would be worth to apply our results to calculations of pygmy resonances in the IVDR strength within the FLD model [35] in a more systematic way. More general problems of the classical and quantum chaos in terms of the level statistics [42] and Poincare and Lyapunov exponents [43, 44] might lead to a progress in studying the fundamental properties of the collective dynamics like nuclear fission within the Swiatecki& Strutinsky Macroscopic-Microscopic model. Our approach is helpful also for further study of the effects in the surface symmetry energy because it gives the analytical universal expressions for the constants k_S, τ and Q as functions of the symmetry slope parameter L which are independent of the specific properties of the nucleus.

Acknowledgement

Authors thank K. Arita, N. Dinh Dang, M. Kowal, V.O. Nesterenko, M. Matsuo, K. Matsuyanagi, J. Meyer, T. Nakatsukasa, A. Pastore, P.-G. Reinhard, A.I. Sanzhur, J. Skalski, and X. Vinas for many useful discussions. One of us (A.G.M.) is also very grateful for a nice hospitality during his working visits at the National Centre for Nuclear Research in Otwock-Swierk and Warsaw, Poland, and at the Nagoya Institute of Technology. This work was partially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft Cluster of Excellence Origin and Structure of the Universe (www.universe-cluster.de) and Japanese Society of Promotion of Sciences, ID No. S-14130.

References

[1] Myers W D, Swiatecki W J 1969 Ann. Phys. **55** 395; 1974 **84** 186

[2] Myers W D, Swiatecki W J 1980 Nucl. Phys. **A336** 267

[3] Myers W D, Swiatecki W J and Wang C S 1985 Nucl. Phys. **A436** 185

[4] Myers W D, Swiatecki W J 1996 Phys. Rev. **C601** 141

[5] Centelles M, Roca-Maza X, Vinas X, and Warda M 2009 Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** 012502

[6] Warda M, Vinas X, Roca-Maza X and Centelles M 2010 Phys. Rev. C **82** 054314

[7] Roca-Maza X, Centelles M, Vinas X and Warda M 2011 Phys. Rev. Lett. **106** 252501

[8] Vinas X, Centelles M, Roca-Maza X and Warda M 2014 Eur. Phys. A **50** 27

[9] Runge E and Gross E K U 1984 Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** 997

[10] Marques M A L and Gross E K U 2004 Annu. Rev. Chem., **55** 427

[11] Brack M, Guet C, and Hakansson H-B 1985 Phys. Rep. **123** 275

[12] Vautherin D and Brink D M 1972 Phys. Rev. C **5** 626

[13] Bender M, Heen P-H, and Reinhard P-G 2003 Rev. Mod. Phys. **75** 125

[14] Chabanat E et al 1997 Nucl.Phys. A**627** 710; 1998 **A635** 231

[15] Klüpfel P, Reinhard R-G, Bürvenich T J and Maruhn J A 2009 Phys. Rev. **C79** 034310

[16] A. Pastore et al 2013 Phys. Scr. **T154** 014014

[17] Strutinsky V M and Tyapin A S 1964 Exp. Theor. Phys. (USSR) **18** 664

[18] Strutinsky V M, Magner A G and Brack M 1984 Z. Phys., A **319** 205

[19] Strutinsky V M, Magner A G and Denisov V Yu 1985 Z. Phys. A **322** 149

[20] Magner A G, Sanzhur A I and Gzhebinsky A M 2009 Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **18** 885

[21] Blocki J P, Magner A G, Ring P and Vlasenko A A 2013 Phys. Rev. **C87** 044304

[22] Agrawal B K, De J N, Samaddar S K at al 2013 Phys. Rev. C **87** 051306

[23] Voinov A et al 2010 Phys. Rev. **C81** 024319

[24] Larsen A C et al 2013, Phys. Rev. **C87** 014319

[25] Repko A, Reinhard R-G, Nesterenko V O and Kvasil J 2013 Phys. Rev. **C87** 024305

[26] Kvasil J, Repko A, Nesterenko V O et al 2013 Phys. Scr. **T154** 014019

[27] Dinh Dang N, Tanabe K and Arima A 1998 Phys. Rev. C **58** 3374; 1999 Phys. Rev. C **59** 3128

[28] Dinh Dang N, Kim Au V, Suzuki T and Arima A 2001 Phys. Rev. C **63** 044302

[29] Ryezayeva N, Hartmann T, Kalmykov Y et al 2002 Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** 272502

[30] Adrich P et al 2005 Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** 132501

[31] Wieland O et al 2009 Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** 092502

[32] Tohyama M and Nakatsukasa T 2012 Phys. Rev. C **85** 031302(R)

[33] Blocki J P, Magner A G and Ring P 2014 Phys. Scr. **T89** 054019

[34] Kolomietz V M and Magner A G 2000 Phys. Atom. Nucl. **63** 1732

[35] Kolomietz V M, Magner A G, and Shlomo S 2006 Phys. Rev. **C73** 024312

[36] Blocki J P, Magner A G and Ring P 2015 to be published.

[37] Meyer J 2014, private communications.

[38] Vretenar D, Paar N, Ring P and Lalazissis G A 2001 Phys. Rev. **C63** R13

[39] Vretenar D, Paar N, Ring P and Lalazissis G A 2001 Nucl. Phys. **A692** 496

[40] Magner A.G, Gorpinchenko D V and Bartel J 2014 Phys. At. Nucl. **77** 1229

[41] Tamii et al 2011 Phys. Rev. Lett. **107** 062502

[42] Blocki J P, Magner A G and Yatsyshyn I S 2010 At. Nucl. Energy **11** 239

[43] Blocki J P, Magner A G and Yatsyshyn I S 2011 Int. J. Mod. Phys. E 20, 292

[44] Blocki J P and Magner A G 2012 Phys. Rev. C **85** 064311